DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 506 TM 860 396

AUTHOR Pfeifer, R. Scott
TITLE Integrating Teacher Evaluation and Staff Development: An Organizational Approach.
INSTITUTION Stanford Univ., Calif. Inst. for Research on Educational Finance and Governance.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accountability; Administrator Attitudes; Educational Change; *Evaluation Criteria; *Feedback; Interviews; Labor Force Development; Management Systems; Qualitative Research; Research Methodology; School Districts; *Staff Development; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Improvement; Teaching Skills

ABSTRACT

Prior research has documented the failure of both staff development and teacher evaluation practices in schools to serve as sources of accountability and improvement for teachers. Few districts coordinate these two aspects of a human resource management system. Using a concept of organizational control, this study employs a qualitative methodology involving elite interviews and document inspection to investigate the experiences of four school districts engaged in a process of evaluation reform. The function of staff development as a mechanism of input control is explored, and the impact on evaluation outcomes is examined. Each district used staff development resources to address the beliefs, attitudes, and skill levels of teachers and administrators that have impeded effective evaluation in the past. The availability of developmental resources that supported evaluative feedback so that teachers could act on the results appeared to be crucial to success. Teacher evaluation, approached in this manner, expands on traditional notions of accountability and improvement that focus on the poor or marginal teacher. Maintenance of effective classroom performance becomes a legitimate goal of evaluation. These tentative findings suggest that a single teacher evaluation system, properly conceived, may be able to simultaneously serve as a source of accountability and improvement for teachers. An appendix describes the methodology employed in the study. (Author/PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED270506

INTEGRATING TEACHER EVALUATION AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT: AN ORGANIZATIONAL APPROACH

R. Scott Pfeifer

Stanford University
School of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R.S. Pfeifer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The National Institute of Education supported this project through Stanford's Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance. I am grateful to Milbrey McLaughlin for her guidance and direction throughout this project, and to David Brazer, Sylvia Yee, and Penny Jones for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

TM 860 396

ABSTRACT

Prior research has documented the failure of both staff development and teacher evaluation practices in schools to serve as sources of accountability and improvement for teachers. Few districts coordinate these two important aspects of a human resource management system.

Using the concept or organizational control as presented by Ouchi (1980) and Peterson (1985), this study employs a qualitative methodology involving elite interviews and document inspection to investigate the experiences of four school districts engaged in a process of evaluation reform. The function of staff development as a mechanism of input control is explored, and the impact on evaluation outcomes is examined.

Each district used staff development resources to address the beliefs, attitudes, and skill levels of teachers and administrators that have impeded effective evaluation in the past. In addition, the availability of developmental resources that supported evaluative feedback so that teachers could act on the results appeared to be crucial to success.

Teacher evaluation, approached in this manner, expands on traditional notions of accountability and improvement that focus on the poor or marginal teacher. Maintenance of effective classroom performance becomes a legitimate goal of evaluation. These tentative findings suggest that a single teacher evaluation system, properly conceived, may be able to simultaneously serve as a source of accountability and improvement for teachers.

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Virtually all organizations embrace two broad goals for their personnel practices:

Accountability--The production of evidence about the value and quality of an individual's performance to support personnel decisions (e.g., dismissal, demotion, promotion, pay increases), and

Improvement--The stimulation of change in individual performance that increases effectiveness.

Many school districts attempt to achieve these two important goals in a single teacher evaluation system (ERS, 1978), but they rarely plan staff development programs based on evaluation outcomes. Little coordination of staff development and teacher evaluation takes place (Wise et al, 1984). In fact, common wisdom suggests that improvement efforts are impeded when they are linked to formal evaluation (e.g., see Acheson and Gall, 1980: 7).

The unfortunate result is that most school districts neither hold teachers accountable for their performance in any meaningful way, nor do they fully address their professional development needs (Bridges and Groves, 1984; Yee, forthcoming). Teacher evaluation is often a pro forma, ritualized activity; administrators often do not formally evaluate their teachers at all (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1980-81; Natriello, 1983). Teachers indicate that evaluation has little if any impact on their performance (Lawton et al, 1983).

The current policy thrust focuses on technical problems of reliability and validity of evaluation instruments to explain this lack of attention to evaluation (e.g., see Medley et al, 1984). But even if policy makers solve these technical problems, several underlying realities of educational organizations help to

explain the dismal state of current practice.

First, administrators and teachers lack the time and resources necessary to transform existing practices in any comprehensive fashion. It takes time to provide teachers concrete feedback on their performance, and even more time to communicate it to them in a manner that will stimulate their own reflection. It takes time to engage in staff development training. It takes money to hire substitutes to cover the classes of teachers receiving training, or to pay teachers who choose to participate after school or in the summer. Matching teachers with professional development opportunities they will find useful does not occur in the absence of an organization-wide commitment to the task (Wise et al, 1984).

Second, a lack of trust between teachers and administrators in a school district often precludes any real learning in an evaluative setting (Manatt, 1982). Reasons for this include 1) the presence of unclear or unacceptable performance criteria for teachers, 2) a lack of teacher involvement in developing these criteria, and 3) infrequent or superficial observations by administrators. In the absence of trust, teachers justifiably subvert any attempts to control their performance in an effort to reduce any potential harm (Lawler, 1971).

Third, few if any models exist to guide districts interested in linking staff development and teacher evaluation processes (Wise et al, 1984). This lack of a clear image of the desired system makes it difficult to construct a plan of action (Stiggins, 1984). School district administrators are less likely to make the commitment of time and money necessary to change teacher evaluation practices if they do not have reasonable

assurance that their efforts will be successful.

These three issues--the lack of time and sufficient resources, the lack of trust, and the lack of acceptable models--make it very difficult for school districts to promote instructional improvement in teachers while simultaneously holding them accountable for performance standards. Some districts may not consider this a priority; others just do not know where to begin.

Using the experience of four school districts, this study explores issues associated with the integration of staff development and teacher evaluation systems so that together, they might effectively address accountability and improvement goals. I will explore various options for linking evaluation and development efforts, and discuss the outcomes associated with each approach. Implications for theory and practice conclude my discussion. (See Appendix A for a description of the research methodology, including how districts were selected, what information was collected, and how it was analyzed.)

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Past efforts to reform teacher evaluation and staff development policies have focused only on limited aspects of design and implementation problems. A broader conceptual framework from organizational theory helps bring into sharper focus the obstacles that prevent more effective practice in this area. All organizations rely on control mechanisms of one sort or another to bring some degree of conformity to the behavior of organizational members. Control is defined broadly here, to include all of those processes by which an organization influences and directs the performances of

individuals in pursuit of common goals (Ouchi, 1977).

Evaluation through the inspection of work and the disposition of sanctions has typically been the focus of much research in this area (e.g., see Dornbusch & Scott, 1975; Natriello, 1984). Formal evaluation because it focuses on the inspection of completed work or performance in progress, is a form of output control. Continued inspection and application of sanctions is necessary to insure that desired performance continues.

But other research has focused attention on the multiple sources of organizational control beyond output control (e.g., see Ouchi, 1980; Peterson, 1985). In this view, output mechanisms are limited in their ability to influence performance, especially in organizations where the work requires creativity and professional judgment. In such cases, alternative control mechanisms centering on organizational inputs are needed to supplement this shortcoming.

Input control mechanisms--alternately called induction processes (Schlechty, 1985), organizational socialization (Van Maanan and Schien, 1979), or culture building (Deal and Kennedy, 1982)--develop in individuals those skills, forms of knowledge, attitudes and values that are necessary to carry out their role in the organization. Staff development has often attempted to do just this. It has enabled teachers to share common meanings regarding change (Fullan, 1982), facilitated the development of a common language teachers can use to discuss instruction (Little, 1982), and promoted specific beliefs and attitudes regarding effective practices (Guskey, 1985). When coupled with evaluation procedures that reinforce specific skills and attitudes, conditions may be possible in which organizational members so internalize

social norms peculiar to a group that they conform even when formal authority is not overtly present (Schlechty, 1985). The primary means of social control becomes self-control.

This discussion suggests that attempts to integrate staff development and teacher evaluation practices within a school district may represent a problem focusing on organizational control. Effective control over performance may come not only from output-based inspection procedures dependent on sanctions, but also from input-based training mechanisms designed to articulate organizational priorities and facilitate agreement regarding goals. The impact of evaluation on teaching performance may vary depending on the extent to which staff development practices are consistent with and support evaluative feedback.

A new set of questions arises from this perspective. What possibilities exist for the integration of input and output control strategies in schools? In what ways can staff development influence the beliefs and attitudes of teachers so that they endorse carefully planned evaluation strategies that are reliable, valid, and supported with training resources? Using the concepts of input and output based control, I will describe and analyze below the experiences of four school districts engaged in a program of teacher evaluation reform, and the role played by staff development in achieving goals of accountability and improvement.

III. FOUR DISTRICTS IN BRIEF

The four districts I visited differ in size, resources, management style, institutional context for change, staff development model in use, past and present teacher evaluation

efforts. They also differ in the stage of development of their teacher evaluation system. However, all four districts have, with varying degrees of success, attempted to install teacher evaluation practices that promote both accountability and improvement, and utilized staff development resources as an integral part of this change effort. The details of each district's experiences with teacher evaluation provide the data for the analysis and argument presented below. (For a more detailed description of each district's efforts, see the case study volume included with McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1986.) Table One, which follows these sketches, summarizes district practices.

SANTA CLARA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (SCUSD)

The Santa Clara Unified School District, composed of approximately 13,000 students in 20 schools, lies in the heart of the Silicon Valley south of San Francisco. Enrollment within the district has steadily declined over the past decade, necessitating 15 school closures and two major district reorganizations.

SCUSD modeled its teacher evaluation system after that developed in the Salt Lake City Public Schools. The backbone of the evaluation system is the remediation process to which principals may assign teachers they judge to be performing inadequately. To be referred for formal remediation, teachers must receive a less than satisfactory rating from their principal who must must have provided appropriate assistance at the school site.

If referred for formal remediation, the teacher and the Assistant Superintendent for Personnel mutually select two to three teachers who agree to act as a remediation team. These individuals

have access to any district resources they deem necessary to assist them in supervising teachers and helping them to improve their performance, including workshops, training materials, and substitute days for observation and conferencing. Strict confidentiality is maintained. At the end of the 60 day remediation period, the team recommends the teacher's continued employment or dismissal. Over the past decade, approximately 29 individuals have undergone formal remediation, with one-half of them voluntarily choosing to resign at the end of the process.

Attention to teacher evaluation by building administrators has waned recently as demonstrated by the fact that only one teacher has been referred for formal remediation over the past two years. The amount of time devoted to evaluation activity varies widely from school to school. Superintendent Gatti attributes this lack of attention to his own failure to make teacher evaluation an active priority in the district. Declining enrollments, fiscal retrenchment, district reorganizations, and curricular reform over the past several years have diverted his attention away from teacher evaluation--which he considers to be the bedrock of his shared governance approach to management.

Until recently, teacher evaluation in SCUSD primarily served accountability goals. But in an effort to address the developmental needs of an aging workforce, and improve the instructional leadership skills of building administrators, the district initiated a comprehensive program of staff development based on Madeline Hunter's instructional theory into practice approach. Entitled Effective Instruction and Support (EIS), the

program introduces participants to the theory of lesson design and requires them to put it into practice under the tutelage of a trained coach. Presently, all administrators, including central office staff, have participated, along with 40% of the district's teachers. In many schools in the district, administrators and teachers who have already received the training use it as a model for formal evaluation. Eventually, all teachers will complete the EIS program, which superintendent Gatti hopes will serve as the focus of the district's teacher evaluation program.

Initial reaction of both teachers and administrators to these expanded staff development offerings has been highly positive, and those teachers who have undergone formal evaluation using the model presented in the EIS program reported receiving their most valuable evaluative feedback in many years.

THE MOUNTAIN VIEW-LOS ALTOS UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT (MVLA)

The Mountain View-Los Altos Union High School District serves approximately 3,000 students in two high schools located in an affluent community that straddles the Silicon Valley area in the San Francisco bay area. Approximately 85% of these students attend college upon graduation, and their achievement test scores are well above California averages.

MVLA has always approached the teacher evaluation in both a serious and experimental manner. In the 70's, teachers engaged in collegial evaluation. They also developed a survey form by which students could evaluate their teachers. The initiation of collective bargaining within the district brought an end to collegial evaluation, but the student survey, many times revised,

still serves as one of several sources of data administrators use in evaluating teacher performance.

Multiple sources of information to increase the reliability and validity of evaluative feedback, coupled with a tight linkage to district staff development efforts, form the backbone of MVLA's teacher evaluation system. Teachers begin the bi-annual evaluation cycle by setting instructional goals consistent with district standards and the content of recent district-wide staff development programs. Three classroom observations coupled with post-conferences provide partial documentation of the teacher's success or failure to attain stated goals. Other sources of data include:

- o Student survey results from two of the teacher's classes,
- o Grading distributions, which are compared across grade levels and departments,
- o Student work samples submitted by the teacher,
- o Teacher-made products such as worksheets and tests, and
- o Additional material jointly agreed to by the teacher and his/her prime evaluator.

Evaluators use their own judgment in weighting this data; no standard formula is used. Administrators assemble the data at year's end and construct lengthy, narrative, final reports which assess strengths and weaknesses on the chosen objectives.

Staff development and teacher evaluation remain tightly coordinated within the district. The district has supported administrators in developing their evaluative skill by devoting a substantial portion of each year's week-long administrative workshop over the past 9 years to evaluation topics. Both teachers and administrators have participated in district-wide staff development initiatives over the past several years, and the content of those workshops now serve as evaluative criteria.

Based on an analysis of recent teacher evaluation reports, the district offered six different workshops, taught by MVLA teachers, on topics ranging from classroom management to the development of higher order thinking skills.

The superintendent, Paul Sakomoto, considers evaluation to be the number one administrative priority in the district, and backs up this belief by personally observing over 90% of MVLA's teachers each year, as well as reading and commenting on every teacher evaluation report produced by administrators. Over the past eight years, 29 unsatisfactory evaluations have been given to 18 teachers within the district, which represents approximately 7% of the teaching workforce. Ten of these individuals were induced to voluntarily resign, with the remainder following remediation plans coupled to local staff development efforts that enabled them to earn a satisfactory rating on a subsequent evaluation.

THE MORAGA SCHOOL DISTRICT

The Moraga School District is a small, elementary school district composed of two elementary schools and one intermediate school that together serve 1400 students. Parents in this bedroom community outside of Oakland, California play an active role in their children's education. The local education foundation annually raises over $70,000 to support Moraga's schools.

Prior to the arrival of the current superintendent, Judith Glickman, teachers and building administrators within the district viewed teacher evaluation as a punitive, biased, tool selectively used to deny teachers merit salary increments in their 18th and

23rd year of service. Evaluation was a source of dissatisfaction for all, and contributed to an overall climate of distrust and poor communication between teachers, the school board, and district administrators.

Glickman set out to construct a positive, instructional climate within the district by conducting personal interviews with every teacher in the district on a yearly basis. She involved building administrators as part of her management team, and solicited participation in district decision making. Most importantly, she supported teaching effectiveness through a district-wide staff development initiative coupled to a revised evaluation system.

Moraga teachers and administrators taught their peers the lesson design theories of Madeline Hunter in a week long workshop held for two consecutive summers. Concurrently, administrators received clinical supervision training. Combining both programs enabled administrators and teachers to discuss the elements of instructional effectiveness in concrete terms, and engage in a process of evaluation that focused on improvement. In contrast to past, informal evaluation practices, the current system is more formalized, and administrators are held strictly accountable for evaluation results. Pre-observation conferences are now standard, written script-tapes accompany each observation, and principals carefully plan post-conferences, which set expectations for future performance.

Declining enrollments have forced many teacher lay-offs in recent years in Moraga. But the number of involuntary lay-offs has been reduced due to Glickman's efforts to make teacher

evaluation and accountability as well as an improvement tool. Over the past four years, 10% of the district's teachers have been induced to resign as a direct result of evaluative feedback coupled to district-wide staff development efforts. And rather than produce dissatisfaction in the remaining teachers, the last four years have brought about a marked increase in teachers' perceptions of the fairness of evaluation.

THE CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG SCHOOLS (CMS)

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, a large, urban school system, serves approximately 72,000 students who live in the city of Charlotte, North Carolina and surrounding Mecklenburg county. The district may be best known for its model approach to desegregation more than a decade ago, but it has also achieved notoriety for its commitment to staff development training (see Schlechty and Crowell, 1982). These efforts recently culminated in the design and implementation of a model career development program for teachers.

Impending action by the North Carolina legislature on a state-wide merit pay plan for teachers prompted CMS superintendent Jay Robinson to charge a committee of local teachers, administrators, parents, and business leaders to investigate the concept and its implications. Convinced that merit pay, as currently conceived, would be detrimental to CMS teachers and students, the committee, under the leadership of Phillip Schlechty, professor of education at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, recommended the development of a comprehensive plan for professional growth. It incorporated

career stages of increasing responsibility and incentive pay that would draw upon the district's demonstrated commitment to staff development. Participation in the Career Development Program is voluntary for experienced teachers, but all new recruits must join. New teachers are referred to as provisional teachers, and those experienced volunteers chosen to participate in the first year are known as Career Candidates. The major innovation in the proposed Career Development program involved a unique approach to evaluation.

Evaluating the teacher's performance is the primary responsibility of a school based committee called an advisory/assessment team, composed of the principal, the assistant principal for instruction (API), and a fellow teacher. For provisional teachers, the fellow teacher is assigned, acting as a mentor. Mentors meet periodically with teachers, helping them to construct a program of professional improvement called an Action Growth Plan. Teachers receive coaching and advice from mentors and peers, they attend district-wide inservice programs, they are given released time to observe effective teachers, and they pursue any other activity that the API and advisory-assessment team believes will help them to progress.

The advisory/assessment team conducts periodic formal and informal observations of the teacher's classroom performance, using the Carolina Teaching Performance Assessment Scale (CTPAS) as the basic evaluation tool. They use this information, plus material provided by the teacher as part of their action growth plan, to assess whether or not the teacher has met prescribed expectations of knowledge and skill. At the end of each semester, the

advisory/assessment team reviews data collected to document the teacher's performance, and arrives at a final rating.

This is only a partial picture, however, because a basic principle undergirding the evaluation system is that reliability only results when multiple evaluations are conducted by numerous individuals employing multiple and explicit criteria over a long period of time. Thus, two additional components of evaluation remain. First, the district employs 9 specially trained, system-wide observer-evaluators who conduct both announced and unannounced classroom observations employing the CTPAS. These individuals then pass their data on to the advisory/assessment team, serving as an external "validity and reliability check" of their deliberations. Finally, the summative judgments of a teacher's competence produced by the advisory/assessment teams are subject to the review and confirmation of both a regional and district-wide committee composed of teachers and administrators.

According to the Director of Staff Development, supporting Career Development is now the focus of district staff development efforts. Provisional teachers receive training in classroom management skills and the elements of effective lesson design. Career candidates receive training tailored to the content of their Action Growth plan. All participants in the program receive training to assist them in understanding the requirements of the Career Development program and the use of the CTPAS. Released time is granted to mentors and provisional teachers to enable them to plan and discuss areas of need, and API's find that their role in the process enables them to effectively broker training resources tailored to the needs of individual teachers.

Charlotte's Career Development Program has operated for only one year. Thus, it is difficult to assess its impact at this time. Of 150 Career Candidates nominated by their peers as outstanding teachers, only 137 were advanced to Career Level I status, with the remaining 13 either choosing to drop out of the program or participate for another year. Approximately 86 of the district's 350 first year provisional teachers have voluntarily resigned, and the director of Career Development estimates that approximately 21 (6%) of all provisional teachers resigned primarily because of negative feedback generated by the evaluation system. The remaining teachers advanced to Provisional II status.

IV. STAFF DEVELOPMENT AS INPUT CONTROL

Integration of staff development and teacher evaluation in the manner I describe requires a shift in the way school districts traditionally define staff development. Rather than one-shot, motivational programs with little or no follow-up--the show and go approach--staff development as an input to the control process is conceived in much broader terms. Fellow teachers, community resources, district workshops, professional conferences, providing substitutes to engage in collegial observation--any and all of these things can support professional growth. When schools assist teachers in identifying domains for future development in light of organizational needs, and then match these needs with available resources, time, and appropriate incentives, both teachers and the district benefit.

Any evaluation where important consequences hang in the balance will produce anxiety. Traditional teacher evaluation

practices usually address this problem by removing any important consequences--evaluation becomes an empty, meaningless, ritual. But an analysis of evaluation practices in the sample districts revealed an alternative approach. Staff development resources lowered anxiety and increased trust in the evaluation process by:

- Describing the evaluation process so that teachers understand the practices and procedures that will be used to arrive at evaluative judgments,
- Defining evaluative criteria in terms simultaneously rooted in theories of effective teaching and the craft knowledge familiar to all teachers, and
- Fostering collegiality and trust between teachers and administrators, thus grounding evaluative feedback in a base of expert rather than bureaucratic authority.

As a source of input control that increases the likelihood that teachers will perceive evaluative feedback as legitimate and professionally based, staff development played an integral role in the evaluation reforms in each district.

Describing the Evaluation Process

Phillip Schlechty, the principal architect of Charlotte's Career Development program highlighted the importance of basic training in evaluation procedures when he stated, "The ideal evaluation system first teaches teachers about the evaluation process." Ignoring this seemingly self-evident advice generates the perceptions of bias and lack of fairness teachers associate with traditional evaluation systems.

Face-to-face communication allows teachers to address concerns with the evaluation process from their own, unique standpoint in the classroom. According to Schlechty, "Management by memo really stinks," and he put this philosophy in practice in planning and

implementing the new evaluation system in Charlotte. Every participant in the new evaluation process attended a week-long summer workshop where they learned in depth about the new procedures. Most teachers found this initial training invaluable, and their complaints centered around the fact that more training would have been desirable. The following comment of one elementary school career candidate is representative:

> The summer workshop...worked through the handbook for career development. We met with the observer-evaluators and they shared with us the training they went through...I wrote down afterwards in my notebook how impressed I was. I felt that the way they presented things was very fair, and that the system, the instrument, was very fair. Also, hearing about the observer-evaluator training was very sensible...I felt confident that the evaluation process would be fair and reliable.

But the impact of initial training experiences wear off rather quickly, and Charlotte has addressed this point by vesting the school-based advisory-assessment teams with the primary responsibility for evaluation. Periodic meetings with their team provides teachers an important source of input and reassurance that they are proceeding according to plan. The assistant principals for instruction occupy the key role in administering the evaluation program at each school, and their careful attention to detail helps insure that teachers remain informed. According to one provisional teacher:

> The API here has helped [me and my mentor] to see what the goal of the program is. She has really helped us understand what [career development] is all about.

The value of thoroughly understanding evaluation procedures in making evaluation useful is also illustrated in Santa Clara's remediation program. Teachers referred to the program are given

released time to meet with the Assistant Superintendent for Personnel, where they receive a thorough description of the remediation process. Later, the teacher meets with the remediation team they helped to select to further specify the process, and clear up any misunderstandings. Released time for team members and the teacher throughout the process provide ample opportunities for interaction to insure that all parties operate under the same set of rules and interpretations.

The full value of evaluation as an improvement tool in Moraga has not been realized in part because of a failure to extend training resources to solidify teachers' understanding of evaluation procedures. Though both teachers and administrators participated in the Elements of Effective Instruction program, only the principals received clinical supervision training. As a result, teachers are sometimes unclear about the uses to which evaluative feedback will be applied. According to one staff development trainer:

> I am attempting to clarify the evaluation procedure for this year. It is unclear at this time...Things haven't been totally explained to teachers about any changes in the process...Now, the process is more formalized. Things are documented...but I don't know what this information will be used for.

This omission is reinforced by one of the building administrators who states:

> I have the clinical supervision part--the teachers don't. They don't understand the whole process. Collegial observations are not working because teachers don't know what to do.

In Mountain View-Los Altos, failure to address head-on teachers' perceptions about the purposes and procedures of the evaluation process produced a great deal of teacher anxiety, a

period of tense relations, and the filing of several grievances between management and the local teachers' union. Though the district invested heavily in administrator training and effective teaching workshops for teachers, it appears that teachers only realized a change in evaluation procedures had occurred when "criteria from the effective teaching workshops began appearing on our evaluations." Many teachers were simply unaware that administrators were directed to approach evaluation more rigorously, and reactions were justifiably defensive. For example, one teacher who had received some recommendations for improvement based on the fact that 10% of her students had rated her poorly stated:

> He told me that 10% is a double digit number and according to district guidelines, this means that this is a weakness and that's why he wrote it down...This was shocking to me.

Because this teacher was unclear about the procedures used to arrive at evaluative judgments, her perception of fairness decreased accordingly.

Defining Evaluative Criteria

Insuring that teachers perceive evaluative criteria to be consistent with sound principles of instruction serves as the bedrock of any evaluation system (Dornbusch & Scott, 1975). But the patchwork of "scientific" findings and "craft" knowledge that form the basis for most teachers' repertoire makes the task of defining system-wide evaluative criteria extremely difficult. Whether a district employs a consultant to develop criteria based on the effective teaching literature, or forms a committee of teachers to pull together local conceptions of best practice, those criteria become meaningful to teachers only when they are

given a chance to apply them, discuss them, modify them, and embrace them. Staff development efforts within a district can provide teachers this opportunity.

Moraga's Elements of Effective Instruction program rests at the base of the revised evaluation procedures. According to Superintendent Glickman, "Staff development articulates what is appropriate instruction." She firmly believed that any revisions of existing evaluation procedures had to begin with the adoption of meaningful criteria. Thus, administrators and selected teachers served as a cadre of staff development trainers who offered the Elements of Effective Instruction program to the rest of the staff over a two year period. Such programs based on the direct instruction model have received criticism in some districts across the country, but teachers in Moraga had nothing but praise for the clarity and definition it brought to the evaluation process:

> (From an elementary school teacher with 20 years experience)
> Tying evaluation to the Elements of Effective Instruction has given us a scaffolding to hang evaluations on. It prevents misunderstandings.
>
> (From the teachers' association president)
> I'm glad to see a formalized and thorough evaluation process. Not only administrators, but teachers, too, have something to refer to.
>
> (From a junior high school teacher)
> To evaluate based on EEI...makes things clear. Other kinds of inservice wouldn't be appropriate. EEI is better...It is good, clear, and simple.

In contrast to the meaningless set of criteria on the old year-end form, every respondent could articulate the various components of the EEI program and apply them in lessons requiring a direct instruction approach.

In Santa Clara, only 40% of the teachers have completed the

Effective Instruction and Clinical Support staff development program. But those who have, and take advantage of the supervision model it advocates as part of the formal evaluation process, speak in terms identical to teachers in Moraga. For example, this elementary teacher expressed the following reaction to using the EIS program as a basis for evaluation:

> Evaluations are more clear. They are more fair. I feel I know what I am being evaluated on. It has given me a good feeling and I know now what is expected of me.

In contrast, those teachers not yet participating find evaluation to be of little value. Their experience reinforces the value of focusing staff development on effective teaching criteria, so that teachers get to practice and apply such principles.

In Mountain View-Los Altos, teachers of all effectiveness levels found the district's staff development workshops valuable in defining evaluative criteria. They participated in several workshops over a three year period, focusing on several different teaching models. According to the Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Robert Madgic, "Now we are evaluating teachers based on behavior that they display in the classroom that comes out of the effective teaching behaviors pointed out in the [staff development] workshops." This fact is now explicitly communicated to teachers at the beginning of the year, as they prepare their own objectives for the evaluation process. And despite previous misunderstandings, teachers now appear to be quite clear that staff development workshops communicate important evaluative criteria. According to one veteran teacher who had just received an average evaluation:

> [The evaluative criteria] were very clear. We have had inservice programs in the district that have focused on what is desirable. These are all practical things to assist us in understanding what's expected of us.

As part of a long-standing commitment to staff development, teachers and administrators in Charlotte had completed training in effective teaching techniques prior to implementation of the Career Development program. All teachers new to the district are also required to complete such training. These workshops correspond closely to the CTPAS, the observation instrument adopted by the district to support the evaluation process. Having been reinforced in training workshops to introduce the new evaluation procedures, it is not surprising that teachers expressed a great deal of understanding in their articulation of these evaluative criteria.

Teacher-Administrator Collegiality

The third, and possibly the most important, role that staff development plays as an input control process involves the sense of collegiality it can promote between teachers administrators. Collegiality is important for at least two reasons. It fosters trust that is absolutely necessary for evaluation to have an impact on teaching practice. Teachers must trust that evaluation will be fair and non-punitive. Administrators must trust that teachers will be candid and supportive of efforts to promote classroom quality. Participation in common staff development training allows teachers and administrators to discover that their goals in the educational process are, indeed, quite similar.

But collegiality between teachers and administrators is also important because it increases the credibility of evaluative

feedback. Evaluators can break through the barriers that teachers construct around their classrooms to maintain autonomy only if teachers perceive them to be credible, knowledgeable professionals who speak from a base of expert, not bureaucratic authority. When teachers perceive that feedback is offered as a tool for reflection and problem-solving, not as a prescription for change from "the boss," evaluation fosters professional growth.

Introduction of the EIS program in Santa Clara illustrates most dramatically both the substantive and symbolic impact of training shared by teachers and administrators. A high school special educator, for example, expressed these thoughts:

> [Joint participation in the EIS program] really made the whole evaluation experience more meaningful for me. Knowing that we both participated made a big difference [in how I perceived my evaluator's expertise]...because most administrators have been out of the classroom for so long it means a lot to know that your evaluator has had to participate in some kind of actual teaching experience. It gives us some basics that we can both focus on.

Another teacher underscored the importance of developing a shared language for discussing instruction:

> Evaluation has definitely changed for me because of the EIS program. Rather than come in and make broad, general, and rather meaningless statements, he now comes in with [much more specific] things he wants to look for. If I ask poor questions, he can explain to me why they are poor and suggest ways I can improve my questioning techniques ...We provide each other feedback as a result of our involvement. He knows that he does a good job and he is able to tell me that I am doing a good job in specific terms.

The training shared by teachers and administrators in Moraga, and the feeling of oneness and trust it generated, rest at the base of their evaluation reforms. As one junior high school teacher summed it up:

> EEI brought the teaching staff together, like we used to do

> a long time ago. We rarely do things together anymore. It helped to strengthen ties. It crossed lines; even the administration was there. It was a cohesive experience and made us feel like a family again.

Teachers and administrators also talked about the value of "a common way of looking at teaching--a vocabulary" that resulted from the workshop. Because the trainers were Moraga's own teachers and administrators, not some outside consultant who would not be available for future consultation, teachers found the EEI program to be "the best inservice we ever had in this district." This sense of collegiality, coupled with the formalization of the evaluation process, contribute to teachers' perceptions of fairness.

Charlotte's evaluation system, involving both school-based advisory/assessment teams and system-wide observer evaluators, reveals different aspects of the role staff development can play in promoting evaluator-teacher collegiality. Advisory assessment teams play an important role as a staff development resource that fosters collegiality among the various participants in the evaluation process in Charlotte. One high school principal provided the following view:

> The advisory-assessment team acts as a help and a critic for the teacher. For example, we were here until 6:00 P.M. last night with one career candidate helping critique her portfolio. She said she had the greatest team that was possible. In some ways, I think it was like having a baby. The career candidates go through high and low periods during the year. But now the baby has arrived. We have completed the evaluation process and as you would expect, we were all excited about that. It's been a long hard labor. The process here at this school has really been a team approach and the quarterback is the teacher. She calls the shots and we are the blockers that make it possible for her to be a winner.

Making teacher evaluation into such a team effort removes the distrust that characterizes evaluation in so many districts.

Face-to-face communication helps individuals to discern the motives and purposes behind evaluative efforts. And when those motivations rest in professional norms and values that promote teaching excellence, evaluation becomes a source of growth.

Summary

Staff development, when broadly conceived, helps to construct an environment where evaluation is important to teachers. Without such a positive environment, even well conceived strategies that define criteria and describe the evaluation process will decay into meaningless bureaucratic exercises. Thus, the strategies just described that utilize staff development as an input to the control process form a package that can't be applied in a piecemeal fashion. Many of the difficulties encountered in installing an evaluation process in the sample districts may be traced back to a failure to attend to the power staff development plays as an evaluation input. Below, I discuss the equally important role staff development plays in support of evaluation as an output control strategy.

V. STAFF DEVELOPMENT TO SUPPORT EVALUATION OUTPUTS

Traditional evaluation practices for teachers, at best, usually involve a year end conference where the teacher receives a series of commendations regarding past performance and recommendations for future improvement. Unless the teacher is judged "unsatisfactory," however, little follow up to these recommendations ever occurs. Teachers are left to their own resources to improve, and receive little if any incentive to act on evaluative recommendations.

No wonder teachers ignore such recommendations. If a

district truly considers evaluation a priority, it will provide feedback in a timely fashion so that a teacher can reflect on it without having to wait until a new school year. If a district truly values improvement, it will provide teachers with more than just advice, it will make resources available to them to act on evaluative recommendations.

The four sample districts demonstrate that evaluation promoting both accountability and improvement need not focus solely on the incompetent. Instead, by supporting performance feedback with resources that serve both professional and organizational goals, a control system results which is not based on rules and the chain of command, but on professional conceptions of effectiveness grounded in classroom practice.

Charlotte's Assistant Superintendent of Personnel stated his district's approach to evaluation and development:

> You can't separate individual development from organizational goals...We expect teachers to perform [according to system-wide goals], but we not only expect them to, we train them so they are able to do it.

According to district administrators, the Career Development program actually grew out of efforts to provide more effective coordination of diverse staff development components. The program merely identified successful elements and suggested ways of organizing them to systematically improve the quality of school programs and school performance.

Charlotte tightly couples evaluative results to district staff development efforts. The main purpose of the advisory assessment team is to serve as a broker of staff development resources in support of the teacher. Through the evaluation

system, new ideas, new methods, and enthusiasm are being generated which are then channeled back into district improvement efforts. As Charlotte's Phillip Schlechty states, "What we need to do is to make the good teachers resources for the ones that have difficulty in given situations." Thus, in one school, the district staff development office planned five workshops in support of career candidates, based on the results of first semester evaluation reports.

The assistant principal for instruction in each of Charlotte-Mecklenburg's schools plays a critical role as the broker of district staff development resources. Their actions in each building determine the quality of the support a teacher receives in responding to evaluative feedback. API's meet periodically to discuss concerns and share resources and ideas they might use to support evaluative feedback. One junior high school provisional teacher who had received some critical feedback regarding her teaching of writing, offered the following example of the type of service an assistant principal for instruction can provide in brokering staff development resources:

> Because they have such a writing emphasis in the school and in the district, they are going to send me to observe a writing teacher in another school. It was the assistant principal for instruction who arranged this and got the sub to cover my classes. I really believe that I need this help and I am looking forward to it...Any issue I need to address, the API has helped me. She has been wonderful. I really haven't had any lack of resources.

An API from another school approached her role in a different way:

> We have provided specific assistance [to provisional teachers] such as assertive discipline workshops and I'm not sure that some of these teachers would have been referred to them without having this evaluation system in place. For example, last year I didn't refer anyone, to specific workshops in the district. This year, I've done it at least 5 times.

Staff development, conceived in this fashion and linked to the evaluation process, redefines the role of the evaluator into a manager of opportunities for professional growth based on evaluative feedback. As a result, professional growth increases organizational productivity.

The remediation process in Santa Clara Unified also illustrates the value of placing training resources at the disposal of evaluator. Remediation specialists have a virtual free hand to utilize any resource to support the improvement of the teacher they are supervising. Remediation team members allow the teacher to obtain released time to observe other successful teachers. They refer the teacher to workshops offered by the district and the state education office. They recommend university courses or courses such as the Bay Area Writing Project. According to one remediation specialist, "I got a blank check agreement that I could use all the substitute time I wanted and that the teacher could have a substitute if she wanted to observe us." Because of this support, all the remediation team members we talked with agreed that if a teacher was not able to improve, they should not be responsible for students in the classroom.

But Mountain View-Los Altos couples their staff development program even more tightly to the evaluation process. The current series of staff development workshops arose from careful inspection of the previous year's evaluation reports for teachers. Topics such as "teaching for higher order thinking skills" and "classroom management" assist teachers in implementing the recommendations of their evaluators. According to one veteran teacher:

> There is no doubt in my mind that evaluation does help teachers improve. The workshops, the suggestions from the principal, the materials they make available to you—all of these are good...There is certainly lots of assistance in this district for improvement...it is sort of hand and glove. They provide you help and then they evaluate you on what you have learned.

Linking staff development to credible, evaluative feedback in this manner increases the likelihood that teachers will act on the results.

Summary

The experience of these school districts suggests an array of strategies for linking staff development to the evaluation process. Together, they function as input and output control mechanisms that coordinate the efforts of teachers toward system-wide goals while at the same time generating increased effectiveness in the classroom. Conceived in this manner, control over performance does not depend exclusively on hierarchical authority, but also relies on professional norms, values, and incentives. Next, I discuss the outcomes that are possible when evaluation and development support learning and control within a school district.

VI. ACHIEVING ACCOUNTABILITY AND IMPROVEMENT

An effective control mechanism in any organization not only insures bottom line accountability, it also fosters learning that enables future adaptation to a changing environment. Both outcomes were evident in the four sample districts. But each district demonstrated that accountability objectives apply not only to incompetent performers, but to teachers of all effectiveness levels. Evaluative feedback supported by staff development resources plays an important role in maintaining effectiveness.

Given evidence that teaching effectiveness may actually decline after as little as five years of experience (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978), evaluation that provides an external "nudge" supported with appropriate assistance fills a critical gap within the teaching profession. Beyond accountability and improvement, maintenance of effective performance is a third important outcome of a control process that marries evaluation and staff development practices.

Table Two lists the three outcomes of teacher evaluation as I have described it, and the elements of each districts' practices that support these goals.

Insert Table Two about here

All of the districts have used evaluation to promote bottom-line accountability, and the number of personnel actions exceeds that found in most school districts. None of them went through formal dismissal proceedings. Instead, extensive feedback and remediation efforts coupled in some cases with financial inducements (e.g., an early retirement package) that offered the individual some security, produced voluntary resignations.

Contrary to popular notions, teachers in each district vigorously embraced accountability goals; they valued the attention their performance received through the evaluation process as long as they perceived that they would be supported in efforts to maintain their effectiveness. Listen to sampling of the comments we encountered:

(From a department coordinator in Mountain View-Los Altos)
The view that teachers are °professionals' and shouldn't be subject to administrators who inspect and evaluate what they do is [hogwash]. We need people to come in and check on us just

like anybody else. As long as it is done in a positive and constructive manner, all it can do is benefit education.

(From a junior high school teacher in Santa Clara)
Evaluation has an important purpose for everyone. I think it helps keep you on your toes as a teacher. [For example], I think I might sit back on my laurels--after all, I've been teaching for 32 years. At this stage, it would be easy for me to [relax]. Just like the kids, when the pressure is taken off, adults tend to coast too. So, I think the pressures of evaluation and the expectations it places on you are good.

(From a provisional teacher in Charlotte)
[Evaluation] is motivating. It keeps me on my toes. You aren't allowed to be sloppy...[Without it], I think I would get in a rut. I'd probably get bored. Evaluation is an incentive that pushes you to improve.

(From an elementary teacher in Moraga)
I wouldn't like it [if there were no evaluation]...I'd feel that [administrators] did not care enough to check and make sure things are right...it is management's responsibility to make sure. I want some accountability.

Teacher evaluation promotes individual accountability by forcing teachers to confront objective accounts of their own practice. When coupled with resources to assist them in improvement efforts, teachers usually seek ways to improve and feel positively about the challenge.

But an atmosphere of trust and face-to-face communication must be present if teachers are to perceive evaluative feedback as non-punitive, and it is here that the coordination of staff development and evaluation becomes most crucial. It helps construct an environment where evaluative feedback stimulates reflection, not fear; it challenges teachers to question taken-for-granted assumptions and analyze their teaching practice. Like "holding up a mirror," evaluation provides a reflection of teaching performance which a teacher can use to adjust, fine-tune, and maintain effectiveness. Again, respondents from the sample districts provide powerful evidence of the effects of teacher evaluation:

(From a department head in Mountain View-Los Altos)
Evaluation makes you sit down to think about what is really happening in your class. You say to yourself, "What am I doing?" Rarely do we have an opportunity in this profession to get introspective. But this process makes this introspection happen. It makes us think about what the purpose of our lesson is, and I think that this is very valuable. Most of this usually gets lost in the rush of day to day activities. The real value of the process is it makes you think.

(From a junior high school provisional teacher in Charlotte)
Evaluation makes you think long and hard as you prepare for each lesson and makes you analyze what you are doing carefully. And I guess this wouldn't always be the case if you weren't participating in the [Career Development] program.

(From a remediation team member in Santa Clara Unified)
Even strong teachers need to be challenged every now and then and the evaluation process can do this. I think the evaluation process provides a way of looking at teaching in new ways.

(From an elementary teacher in Moraga)
[Evaluation] really has made me more conscious about how I do things in my classroom. [Because of evaluation] I am much more conscious overall about my practice and I think about my lessons more systematically...

Teachers gave consistent support to the view of one administrator in Moraga: "The only true education is self-education and the only true improvement is self improvement." To the extent that a teacher evaluation stimulates teachers to reflect in the manner they describe above, it becomes a powerful force for maintaining effectiveness.

The institutional rewards of teaching are so paltry in most school districts, that even when an atmosphere of trust exists and teachers are given the time and resources to reflect and experiment, they throw up their hands and exclaim, "Why bother!" Though intrinsic rewards grounded in student learning remain the primary incentive for teaching excellence, teachers still require validation for their effectiveness from institutional sources--professional recognition from superiors and peers. When a school

district commits the resources of time, expertise, and money to coordinate evaluation and staff development, it sends a powerful message to teachers about the value of their work. Teachers from the sample districts speak to the importance of professional validation as an important motivator:

(From a Santa Clara teacher who received an average evaluation)
I've never had an evaluation this thorough as this before...it made me feel a bit more worthwhile. It really gave me a boost. It's important for the administration to give you an 'atta girl' and this helps motivate you...If the administration doesn't care what I do, then I'm not going to care as much either.

(From a department head in Mountain View-Los Altos)
If you are a person with high standards, you need to have a pat on your back now and then. Without evaluation, I would get very few strokes on my performance and getting these strokes helps me be a better teacher and put things into perspective. This year in particular was a tough year and the positive strokes really helped.

(From a career candidate in Charlotte-Mecklenburg)
I need the reassurance of people looking at what I am doing. If we are not looked at, we get the attitude that nobody cares. I think it can bring about a lack of motivation and I think this has happened to many teachers.

(From a Moraga elementary school teacher)
I want the administration to be interested in what I am doing...It gives a teacher a sense of importance when [an administrator] feels what they're doing is important enough for him to drop in to see how it is going.

(From an English teacher in Mountain View-Los Altos)
I think the strength [of evaluation] is the time that the administrators take in doing evaluations. It is really used as a reward for those who do well...we all need positive strokes and for me, [evaluation] served as a real reward this year...It was an attempt to show that he [the principal] appreciated me. He praised me tremendously and wrote careful pages and pages of detailed observations and data.

This discussion highlights the fact that the outcomes of an evaluation procedure that is coordinated with staff development efforts produces both substantive and symbolic outcomes that work together to produce an institutional climate generating effectiveness. A failure to attend to the symbolic aspects of

evaluation reform may, in the long run, lie at the base of past evaluation failures. Table Three describes the substantive and symbolic effects of evaluation coupled to staff development.

Insert Table Three about here

The substantive value of targeting resources to evaluation and staff development practices has already been elaborated. Providing documentation for personnel decisions, describing evaluation criteria and procedures, and offering training that supports evaluative feedback, all represent necessary substantive components for achieving accountability and improvement. But more importantly, institutional attention to these practices stands as a symbol of district priorities. Taking time to document effective as well as incompetent teaching, and providing resources to maintain that effectiveness tells teachers that excellence is valued. Investing limited resources in training for teachers and administrators tells teachers that support--not punishment--is the ultimate goal of evaluation activity. Only when teachers fully accept this fact will the walls that prevent honest collegial exchange topple. Coordination of staff development and evaluation can construct a social context where trust and open communication are the norm. And the same norms that lead teachers to improve based on credible, evaluative feedback also lead teachers to voluntarily resign when that evidence suggests that they are not suited for teaching. In the words of Charlotte's Phillip Schlechty

> Developing an evaluative culture around which everything else will hang is really difficult, but that must be our focus. Problems will disappear if we just stick to this culture-building exercise.

Each of the sample districts has taken the initial steps toward this end.

Despite any shortcomings, each district's approach to evaluation reform acknowledges that evaluation is only one part of a larger control system that operates through inputs and outputs. Evaluative feedback supported by staff development resources serves as a mechanism of output control that links organizational sanctions to performance. But these activities also construct a context that merges organizational and professional goals. As input control mechanisms that support improvement, evaluation coordinated with staff development circles back to further strengthen the organization.

Examination of the experiences four school districts employed within their unique contexts can enable planners in other districts committed to evaluation reform to identify key leverage points. This perspective on evaluation reform that focuses not on the technical consideration of instrument design, but on the organizational conditions that promote trust, open communication, and support serves as an important object lesson for those that follow. And the initial results indicate that both accountability and improvement objectives can simultaneously be served when districts coordinate teacher evaluation and staff development practices.

REFERENCES

Acheson, K.A., and M.D. Gall, Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers, Longman: New York, 1980.

Berman, P. and M.W. McLaughlin, Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, The Rand Corporation, R-1589-HEW, 1978.

Bridges, E. with B. Groves, Managing the Incompetent Teacher, Stanford University, Institute for Educational Finance and Governance: Stanford, 1984.

Deal, T.E. and A. Kennedy, Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life, Addison-Wesley: Reading, PA, 1982.

Dornbusch, S.M. and W.R. Scott, Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority, Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, 1975.

Educational Research Service, Evaluating Teacher Performance, Arlington, VA, 1978.

Fullan, M., The Meaning of Educational Change, Teachers College Press: New York, 1982.

Guskey, T.R., "Staff Development and Teacher Change," Educational Leadership. 42:7, April, 1985, 57-60.

Lawler, E.E., Pay and Organizational Effectiveness: A Psychological View, McGraw-Hill: New York, 1971.

Lawton, S.B. and E.S. Hickox, K.A. Leithwood, and D.F. Musella, Performance Appraisal of Certificated Education Staff in Ontario School Boards, Non-Technical Report, Ontario Ministry of Education: Toronto, Canada, 1984.

Little, J., School Success and Staff Development: The Role of Staff Development in Urban Desegregated Schools, Center for Action Research: Boulder, CO, 1982.

Lortie, D.C., Schoolteacher, University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1975.

Mannatt, R., Teacher Performance Evaluation: Practical Application of Research, Iowa State University, Occasional Paper 82-1: Ames, IA, January, 1982.

McLaughlin, M.W. and R.S. Pfeifer, Teacher Evaluation: Learning for Improvement and Accountability, Institute for Educational Finance and Governance: Stanford University, forthcoming.

Medley, D.M., H. Coker, and R.S. Soar, Measurement Based Evaluation of Teacher Performance: An Empirical Approach, Longman: New York, 1984.

Natriello, G., "Teachers' Perceptions of the Frequency of Evaluation and Assessments of Their Effort and Effectiveness," American Educational Research Journal, Fall, 1984.

Natriello, G., Evaluation Frequency, Teacher Influence, and the Internalization of Evaluation Processes: A Review of Six Studies Using the Theory of Evaluation and Authority, Center for Educational Policy and Management, College of Education, University of Oregon: Eugene. November, 1983.

Natriello, G. and S.M. Dornbusch, "Pitfalls in the Evaluation of Teachers by Principals," Administrator's Notebook, 29(6), 1980-81.

Ouchi, W.G., "The Relationship Between Organizational Structure and Organizational Control," Administrative Science Quarterly, 22: 1977, 95-113.

Ouchi, W.G., "Markets, Bureaucracies, and Clans, " Administrative Science Quarterly, March, 1980, 129-141.

Peterson, K.D., "Mechanisms of Administrative Control over Managers in Educational Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 29: 1984, 573-579.

Schlechty, P.C. and D. Crowell, Understanding and Managing Staff Development in an Urban School System, (Final Report, Contract 400-79-0056) National Institute of Education: Washington, D.C., 1982.

Schlechty, P.C., "Induction: A Framework for Evaluating Induction Into Teaching," Journal of Teacher Education, January-February, 1985, 37-41.

Stiggins, R.J. and K. Bridgeford, Performance Assessment for Teacher Development, Center for Performance Assessment, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory: Portland, Oregon, January, 1984.

Van Maanen, J.V. and E.H. Schein, "Toward an Organizational Theory of Socialization," Research in Organizational Behavior, B. Staw, ed., JAI Press: Greenwich, CT, 1979.

Wise, A.E., L. Darling-Hammond, M.W. McLaughlin, and H.T. Bernstein, Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices, Rand Corporation: Santa Monica, California, June, 1984.

Yee, S., Moving Beyond District Inservices: Facilitating Professional Development for Teachers, Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April, 1986.

APPENDIX A

Methodology Employed in this Study

Data for this project were collected as part of a larger research effort on teacher evaluation funded by Stanford University's Institute for Educational Finance and Governance. To inform our research question, we identified four school districts that could inform the process of initiating and implementing teacher evaluation and staff development practices that serve dual purposes of learning and control. Though not necessarily models of effectiveness, each of these districts has been successful to a degree in linking teacher evaluation to staff development strategies. All of them have taken the difficult, initial step of defining the correct problem to be solved.

Based on nominations received from other researchers in the field, local superintendents, and knowledgeable California State Education Agency personnel, we gathered data in four school districts across the country:

- The Santa Clara Unified School District Santa Clara, California;
- The Mountain View-Los Altos Union High School District, Mountain View, California;
- The Moraga School District, Moraga, California;
- The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, Charlotte, North Carolina.

In selecting these districts, we considered demographic criteria, fiscal capacity, district size, the model of teacher evaluation and staff development in use, and its degree of implementation. Those eventually chosen display broad variation on these variables. Their differing contexts for change and differing evaluation system designs allowed us to generate a broad set of propositions.

In each district, we began by contacting the central office staff member with major responsibility for teacher evaluation and secured documentation pertaining to school district personnel and teacher evaluation policies. Relevant record data we reviewed included district evaluation and staff development goal and policy statements, evaluation instruments and manuals, collective bargaining agreements, training materials, and samples of completed evaluation reports.

After reviewing this information, we spent from one to three weeks interviewing the superintendent (with the exception of Jay Robinson in Charlotte), the director of personnel (and staff development, if there was one), senior administrators in the central office, and other central office staff concerned with teacher evaluation. We also interviewed officers of the local

teachers' organizations and knowledgeable reporters from the local media.

The varying size of each district produced different strategies for sampling teachers and administrators at the school site level. In Moraga and MVLA, we interviewed principals and their assistants in every school, along with 5-6 teachers whom they selected to represent a wide range of experience with the evaluation and staff development system. In SCUSD, 6 administrators in 3 of the district's 15 schools were interviewed, along with 14 teachers. Three members of the district's evaluation committee, 3 remediation team members, and 3 staff development trainers also served as respondents. In Charlotte, we visited 4 high schools, 4 junior highs, and 5 elementary schools of differing neighborhood type and degree of implementation of the career development program. In all, we spoke with 8 building level administrators, 10 central office personnel, and 24 teachers.

With all of our respondents, we sought their perceptions of the role teacher evaluation and staff development played in improving the overall quality of instruction in the district. From central office personnel, we obtained a formal description of the teacher evaluation policy, how it had been developed, and the motivation for adopting a particular design. We learned about the range of staff development offerings in the district, how they were planned, and what alternatives were considered. We also sought information regarding the community's political context, the district's management style, and the way in which evaluation was coordinated with other district management activities. From building level administrators, we sought information regarding how the formal evaluation policy was implemented, what resources they had at their disposal to support teacher evaluation in their school, and how it affected their ability to attain instructional and other school goals.

From teachers, we sought an understanding of the role staff development and evaluation played in their day-to-day life, its impact on their own sense of satisfaction and efficacy, and the general manner with which district policy supported their instructional effectiveness. Teachers' organization officials provided us with information regarding the history of labor-management relations in the district, their role in developing the current evaluation system, and their perceptions of its fairness, reliability, and validity.

Interviews from the four districts were transcribed and combined with the record data to construct case studies describing each district's experience of designing and implementing a teacher evaluation policy. We then coded the data based on categories generated by our literature review, addressing reliability through the use of multiple coders. In addition, one respondent from each district was recruited to review the initial propositions generated during data analysis, providing feedback regarding their validity.

TABLE ONE

A Comparison of Staff Development and Teacher Evaluation Policies

	CHARLOTTE	MORAGA	MVLA	SCUSD
Eval. and Staff Dev. a priority w/Sup't.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not in recent years
Who plans Staff Dev. & Eval.	Steering Com. of Tch, Adm, and Community	Cent. Office & Bldg. Admin.	Cent. Office Admin. w/some Tch & Adm Input	Committee of Tch & Adm
Sequence	Staff Dev. reform preceeds eval. reform	Staff Dev. reform preceeds eval. reform	Evaluation reform preceeds staff dev.	Evaluation reform preceeds staff dev.
Role of Staff Dev. in Eval. Planning	Describe Proc. Define Criteria	Define criteria Foster Tchr-Adm Collegiality	Define criteria	Define criteria Describe Proc w/EIS and Remed
Role of Staff Dev to Support Eval Feedback	Totally geared to support eval	Few resources available	Closely linked to evaluative feedback	Tight linkage w/remediation only
Who conducts Staff Dev.	Teachers & Consultants	Teachers & Administrators	Teachers	Teachers & Administrators
Who particip. in Staff Dev.	Common train. for evaluators & teachers	Common train. for teachers & Administrators	Some training shared by teach. & Admin.	Common training in recent Staff Dev.
Incentives for Staff Dev.	Summer Wksps. Incentive Pay Substitutes	Summer Wksps.	Incentive Pay	Substitutes Incentive Pay
Who Evaluates	Peers, Admin., Observer/Eval.	Principals	Administrators	Administrators
Sources of Eval. Info.	Multiple obs. by Admin. & Peers + Action Growth Plan	2-3 observ. of classroom teaching	Many sources inc. observ., student rtgs. Teacher Prod.	2-3 observ. of classroom tch. except for remediation.
Sanctions of Evaluation	Pay Increases Career Adv.	Pay at yr 18 & 23. Dismissal	Salary Freeze Unsatis. Rtg.	Unsatis. Rtg. Remediation Dismissal
Admin. held Acct. for Eval Quality	No	Yes	Yes	No

TABLE THREE

Substantive and Symbolic Outcomes of Teacher Evaluation and Staff Development

	Substantive Outcomes	Symbolic Outcomes
Teacher Evaluation	Support for personnel decisions Support for dismissal or induced resignations	Communicate district priorities Recognize outstanding accomplishments
Staff Development	Describe district Policies & Procedures Provides technical assistance to support improvement efforts	Communicate district priorities Construct a context where teachers interpret district influence attempts in a positive light

TABLE TWO

Role of Teacher Evaluation and Staff Development in Supporting Outcomes of Accountability, Maintenance, and Improvement

OUTCOMES	CHARLOTTE	MORAGA	MVLA	SCUSD
BOTTOM-LINE ACCOUNT-ABILITY	AA team, O/E's, District Review; 6% provisional resign; 9% CC's denied advance.	Principals construct remediation plans. 10% induced to resign	Detailed remediation plans. 4% rated Unsat. 3% induced to resign	Remediation team 26 referred Half induced to resign
MAINTENANCE	AA teams, API provide support Rigorous inspect. at all levels	EEI staff dev. validated teacher effort; Collegiality	Extensive fdbk from multiple sources tied to staff dev wksps	EIS staff dev. validates tchr effort when linked to eval.
IMPROVEMENT	Support of AA team to complete AGP; increased status up ladder Many resources	Principals foster growth through clinical supervision	Intensive fdbk supported by staff dev. w/in district	Coaching w/in EIS staff dev. fosters growth